

RUB-TPII-22/92

November, 1992

ANALYSIS OF $\Delta^+(1232)$ ISOBAR OBSERVABLES WITH IMPROVED QUARK DISTRIBUTION AMPLITUDES

N. G. Stefanis and M. Bergmann

*Institut für Theoretische Physik II**Ruhr-Universität Bochum**D-4630 Bochum, Germany*

A model distribution amplitude for the $\Delta^+(1232)$ isobar is proposed, derived on the basis of the QCD sum-rule calculations of Farrar et al. combined with those of Carlson and Poor. The transition form factor $\gamma p \Delta^+$ is calculated modeling the proton by selected distribution amplitudes. Furthermore, predictions are made for some exclusive charmonium decays into $\Delta \bar{\Delta}$. The obtained results are compared with other theoretical models and with the available data.

Internet: michaelb@photon.tp2.ruhr-uni-bochum.de

nicos@hadron.tp2.ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Bitnet: KPH509@DJUKFA11

Typeset Using *REVTEX*

The short-distance behavior of exclusive amplitudes and in particular of the hadronic form factors at large momentum transfer has attracted continuous interest in the past decade. The theoretical basis is provided by the factorization theorem within a convolution formalism [1]. The nonperturbative information on the quark structure of the hadron is contained in the distribution amplitude $\Phi(x_i, Q^2)$, which is the integral over the transverse momenta of the hadron valence-quark wave function. In a physical gauge (e.g. $A^+ = 0$), it is the probability amplitude for the hadron to consist of valence quarks with longitudinal momentum fractions $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$, $\sum_i x_i = 1$ (in a p_∞ frame) moving collinearly up to a scale Q^2 . Contributions from higher Fock states are suppressed by powers of the momentum transfer.

Theoretical constraints on the shape of the hadron distribution amplitudes can be obtained from QCD sum rules [2] and lattice gauge theory [3]. For the nucleon, various model distribution amplitudes have been proposed [4,5,6,7] and detailed studies have been carried out [8,9,10,11]. More recently, the quark structure of the $\Delta^+(1232)$ and higher resonances has been investigated [12,13,14] and models for the valence part of their distribution amplitudes have been worked out [15,16].

It was shown in [17] that the transition form factor G_M^* and the neutron magnetic form factor G_M^n are anti-correlated so that one of those form factors tends to be large when the other is small. If one uses the CZ [4] or the COZ [7] nucleon distribution amplitude, $|G_M^*|$ turns out to be nearly zero, whereas $|G_M^n|/G_M^p \leq 0.5$. This possibility would explain why the data on the ratio F_{E2}/F_{M1} yield a value compatible with zero. On the other hand, the GS [5] nucleon distribution amplitude gives by construction $|G_M^n|/G_M^p \leq 0.1$ and a $|G_M^*|$ of the same order of magnitude as G_M^p . This behavior is consistent with the possibility that σ_n , the electron-neutron differential cross section, is dominated by G_E^n , while G_M^n is asymptotically small or equivalently that $|F_1^n| \ll |F_2^n|$ at all Q^2 values [18]. These results were obtained under the assumption that the Δ distribution amplitude can be approximately represented by the symmetric part of the nucleon one. However, the anti-correlation pattern still holds also for more realistic models for the Δ distribution amplitude (see [15] and below).

From the experimental side [19], there is still no clear evidence whether $Q^4|G_M^*|$ levels

off or drops to zero at large Q^2 . A recent analysis [14] of the unpublished data of the SLAC experiment E133 points rather to the second possibility, though the precision of the data is yet not sufficient to single out one possibility over the other.

The theoretical predictions for the normalization and the Q^2 evolution of G_M^* are sensitive to the shape of the proton distribution amplitude. It is therefore essential to have reliable models for both the nucleon and the Δ distribution amplitudes to be able to make comparisons with the data in precise detail.

In a previous letter [20], we have shown that two widely used models for the nucleon distribution amplitude, the Chernyak-Ogloblin-Zhitnitsky (COZ) model and the Gari-Stefanis (GS) model — treated previously as competing alternatives — can be unified into a single model: the heterotic model. This model provides the possibility to analyze the data on σ_n under the assumption that $|G_M^n|/G_M^p \leq 0.1$ (like the GS model), while matching the sum-rule requirements [7] on the moments of Φ_N up to the third order with almost the same overall accuracy as with the COZ model. Furthermore, the calculated decay widths of the charmonium states 3S_1 , 3P_1 , and 3P_2 into $p\bar{p}$ are in excellent agreement with the data [21] without individual adjustment of the various parameters. No other existing model is so successful in that respect [11,22,23].

In the present letter, we apply similar ideas to derive an optimum distribution amplitude for the $\Delta^+(1232)$ isobar. The new element of our approach is that we treat the sum-rule analysis of Carlson and Poor [15] in conjunction with that of Farrar *et al.* [16]. A second result of this paper is the calculation of the transition form factor G_M^* in remarkable agreement with the data. In addition, we make predictions for the decay widths of the charmonium states 3S_1 , 3P_1 , and 3P_2 into $\Delta\bar{\Delta}$.

To leading order, the quark distribution amplitude for the baryon with helicity $+1/2$ can be represented in the form:

$$\Phi_{[1/2]}(x_i, Q^2) = \Phi_{as}(x_i) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n^{[1/2]}(\mu^2) \left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{\alpha_s(\mu^2)} \right)^{\gamma_n} \tilde{\Phi}_n(x_i), \quad (1)$$

where $\Phi_{as}(x_i) = 120 x_1 x_2 x_3$ and $\{\tilde{\Phi}_n(x_i)\}$ are the eigenfunctions of the interaction kernel

of the evolution equation, expressed in terms of Appell polynomials [1]. The corresponding eigenvalues γ_n equal the anomalous dimensions of the lowest-twist three-quark operators carrying the appropriate baryonic quantum numbers and are perturbatively calculable renormalization-group coefficients [24]. Note that in the Δ case only eigenfunctions symmetric under $x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3$ contribute (i.e. $B_1^\Delta = B_4^\Delta \equiv 0$).

The expansion coefficients $B_n^{[1/2]}$ are nonperturbative quantities representing matrix elements of three-quark operators interpolating between the vacuum and the helicity $+1/2$ baryon (the nucleon (N) or the $\Delta^+(1232)$ isobar), renormalized at a scale μ^2 :

$$\langle \Omega | O_\gamma^{(n_1 n_2 n_3)}(0) | b^{[1/2]}(p) \rangle = f_{N(\Delta)}(z \cdot p)^{n_1+n_2+n_3+1} S_\gamma^{[1/2]}(p) O^{(n_1 n_2 n_3)}. \quad (2)$$

Here z is a lightlike vector ($z^2 = 0$), with $z \cdot q = q^+ = q^0 + q^3$ for any vector q , $S_\gamma^{[1/2]}(p)$ is the spin function of the baryon with helicity $+1/2$, and $f_{N(\Delta)}$ is a dimensionful constant denoting the value of the matrix element at the origin.

To carry out sum-rule calculations [2,4,6,10,15,16], one uses correlators involving two of the $O_\gamma^{(n_1 n_2 n_3)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(n_1 n_2 n_3, m)}(q, z) &= i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle \Omega | T(O_\gamma^{(n_1 n_2 n_3)}(0) \hat{O}_{\gamma'}^{(m)}(x)) | \Omega \rangle (z \cdot \gamma)_{\gamma\gamma'} \\ &= (z \cdot q)^{n_1+n_2+n_3+m+3} I^{(n_1 n_2 n_3, m)}(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $(z \cdot \gamma)_{\gamma\gamma'}$ serves to project out the leading twist-structure of the correlator. To obtain constraints on the moments of the baryon distribution amplitude,

$$\Phi_{N(\Delta)}^{(n_1 n_2 n_3)} = \int_0^1 [dx] x_1^{n_1} x_2^{n_2} x_3^{n_3} \Phi_{N(\Delta)}(x_i), \quad (4)$$

($[dx] = dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \delta(1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3)$) a short-distance operator product expansion is performed at some spacelike momentum μ^2 where quark-hadron duality is valid. By virtue of the orthogonality of the eigenfunctions $\tilde{\Phi}_n$, the coefficients $B_n^{[1/2]}(\mu^2)$ and the constant $f_{N(\Delta)}$ can be determined by means of moments inversion using as constraints the sum-rule requirements. The baryon distribution amplitude is then expressed in the form of a truncated series of Appell polynomials of up to second order, which means that we take into account the first six terms: $n = 0, 1, \dots, 5$.

The coefficients for the heterotic nucleon distribution amplitude were determined in [20]: $B_0 = 1$ (due to the normalization condition $\int_0^1 [dx] \Phi_N(x_i) = 1$), $B_1 = 3.4437$, $B_2 = 1.5710$, $B_3 = 4.5937$, $B_4 = 29.3125$, and $B_5 = -0.1250$. [Here and below the conventions and analytical expressions given in [10] are used.] The profile of $\Phi_N^{Heterotic}$ is shown in Fig. 1.

In this note we treat the sum rules defined in Eq. (3) for $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \leq 3$ and $m = 1$ by exploiting the possibility of simultaneously satisfying the moment constraints on the Δ distribution amplitude of both the Carlson and Poor [15] and the Farrar *et al.* [16] analyses. In this way we obtain a Δ distribution amplitude which has the explicit form

$$\Phi_{\Delta}^{Het}(x_i) = \Phi_{as}(x_i) \{7.2041 - 8.2859x_2 - 21.3682x_1x_3 - 4.9247(x_1^2 + x_3^2)\} \quad (5)$$

with coefficients B_n^{Δ} given in Table I in comparison with those we determined for the specific model forms proposed by the above authors. Remarkably, like the nucleon case, this solution has heterotic character (see Fig. 2).

From Table II we can see that all the moments of the heterotic solution are within the range calculated by FZOZ for the amplitude $T_{\Delta}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \Phi_{\Delta}(x_2, x_3, x_1)$. Furthermore, the CP constraints on the amplitude $V_{\Delta}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \Phi_{\Delta}(x_1, x_2, x_3) + A_{\Delta}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ are also satisfied, with the exception of the moment $V^{(001)}$ for which the heterotic solution yields a value slightly smaller than the estimated minimum value of the corresponding sum rule. Note that if one takes the estimated margins of both analyses [15,16] as they stand, then it is not possible to find a solution for the Δ distribution amplitude of the form given by Eq. 1 which simultaneously satisfies all sum-rule constraints.

Following [12] we input the heterotic nucleon distribution amplitude to calculate the $N - \Delta^+$ transition form factor G_M^* , modeling the Δ^+ isobar by the three options labeled CP, FZOZ, and Heterotic. The Q^2 evolution is due to the one-loop approximation of $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ with $\Lambda_{QCD} = 180$ MeV [25]. Here the average of two coupling constants $\bar{\alpha}_s^N(Q^2)$ and $\bar{\alpha}_s^{\Delta}(Q^2)$ is used, with arguments weighted by the virtualities determined for each model. For the heterotic Δ distribution amplitude we obtain $\bar{\alpha}_s^{\Delta(Het)}(Q^2) = [\alpha_s(Q^2 \times 0.494) \alpha_s(Q^2 \times 0.088)]^{1/2}$; the corresponding values of $\bar{\alpha}_s(Q^2)$ for the other considered models are given in

[20] and references cited therein.

The results are shown in Fig. 3, where also comparison is made with the predictions for G_M^* derived from $\Phi_\Delta^{Heterotic}$ in conjunction with previous models for nucleon distribution amplitudes. The experimental data are compiled in [19]. In all cases the CP value $|f_\Delta| = 11.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2$ has been used, which is within the spread of the FZOZ estimate. We emphasize that the sign of G_M^* predicted by CZ [4], COZ [7], and GS [5] comes out negative for all Δ distribution amplitudes discussed here (cf. [22]). It is only the heterotic [20] nucleon distribution amplitude and the KS [6] one that yield a positive sign for G_M^* .

In order to account for (unknown) confinement effects at low Q^2 , we saturate α_s by introducing an effective gluon mass: $\bar{\alpha}_s(Q^2) \mapsto \bar{\alpha}_s(Q^2 + 4m_g(Q^2))$. The situation is illustrated in Fig. 4. In contrast to other approaches of this type [8,26], we use a dynamical, i.e., scale-dependent gluon mass derived by Cornwall [27]:

$$m_g(Q^2) = m_g^2 \left\{ \ln \left(\frac{Q^2 + 4m_g^2}{\Lambda_{QCD}^2} \right) \middle/ \ln \left(\frac{4m_g^2}{\Lambda_{QCD}^2} \right) \right\}^{-12/11}. \quad (6)$$

Due to the positivity of the anomalous dimension of the mass operator, this gluon mass vanishes asymptotically. This soft behavior at short distances leaves the validity of the form-factor evolution at large momentum transfer virtually unaffected. In the fit shown in Fig. 4 (dashed-dotted line), we take $m_g = 380 \text{ MeV}$, which agrees with Cornwall's consistency relation $m_g/\Lambda_{QCD} \approx 1.5 - 2.0$.

Referring to the same figure, we see that including the perturbative Q^2 evolution of the coefficients B_n^Δ (cf. Eq. (1)), it is sufficient to provide a good fit to the data above $Q^2 \approx 3 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ (dashed line). At lower Q^2 values, additional nonperturbative parameters have to be introduced in the way just described (e.g., effective parton masses, quark clustering etc.) to account for the limitations of the leading-order formalism.

In conclusion of this work, we make predictions for the exclusive decays of the charmonium levels 3S_1 , 3P_1 , and 3P_2 into $\Delta\bar{\Delta}$. We here follow [11,20]. The branching ratio of the decay of the $J^{CP} = 1^{++}$ state into $\Delta\bar{\Delta}$ is given by

$$BR \left(\frac{^3P_1 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta}}{^3P_1 \rightarrow all} \right) \approx \frac{0.75}{\ln(\bar{M}/\Delta)} \frac{16\pi^2}{729} \left| \frac{f_\Delta}{\sqrt{3}M^2} \right|^4 (M_1^\Delta)^2, \quad (7)$$

where $\bar{M} \approx 2m_c \approx 3$ GeV and $\Delta = 0.4$ GeV (the last value is taken from [28]-see also [29]).

The analogous expression for the $J^{PC} = 2^{++}$ state has the form

$$BR\left(\frac{{}^3P_2 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta}}{{}^3P_2 \rightarrow all}\right) \approx 0.85(\pi\alpha_s)^4 \frac{16}{729} \left| \frac{f_\Delta}{\sqrt{3}\bar{M}^2} \right|^4 (M_2^\Delta)^2. \quad (8)$$

The partial width of the $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$ state into $\Delta\bar{\Delta}$ is

$$\Gamma({}^3S_1 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta}) = (\pi\alpha_s)^6 \frac{1280}{243\pi} \frac{|f_\psi|^2}{\bar{M}} \left| \frac{f_\Delta}{\sqrt{3}\bar{M}^2} \right|^4 (M_0^\Delta)^2, \quad (9)$$

where f_ψ determines the value of the 3S_1 -state wave function at the origin. Its value can be extracted from the leptonic width $\Gamma({}^3S_1 \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (4.72 \pm 0.35)$ keV [21] via the Van Royen-Weisskopf formula. The result is $|f_\psi| = 383$ MeV with $m_{J/\psi}$ equal to its experimental value [21]. The nonperturbative input is due to f_Δ and the decay amplitudes M_1^Δ , M_2^Δ , and M_0^Δ . The results for the specific models considered here are summarized in Table III. For the branching ratio of the 3S_1 state, the heterotic distribution amplitude yields $BR({}^3S_1 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta}/{}^3S_1 \rightarrow all) = 0.30 \times 10^{-2}\%$, where the new [30] value $\Gamma_{tot} = 85.5_{-5.8}^{+6.1}$ keV is used. Note that in all considered decays $\alpha_s(m_c) = 0.210 \pm 0.028$ (see third paper of [28]).

We have performed our analysis pretending that factorization applies to exclusive reactions, so that a perturbative treatment is justified at accessible momentum transfer. This issue has been questioned by Isgur and Llewellyn-Smith [31] and also by Radyushkin [32], who argued that soft contributions dominate even at enormous momentum scales, rendering perturbative QCD inadequate for exclusive reactions. However, more recently, Li and Sterman [33] have shown that there is an infrared protection of the perturbative picture provided by Sudakov effect suppression.

In summary, we believe that the heterotic distribution amplitudes Φ_N^{Het} and Φ_Δ^{Het} are physically appropriate solutions in terms of which several exclusive reactions can be theoretically described without invoking additional assumptions and without tuning the various physical parameters from case to case.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D22** (1980) 2157
- [2] V. L. Chernyak and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rep. **112**, (1984) 173
- [3] D. G. Richards, C. T. Sachrajda, and C. J. Scott, Nucl.Phys. **B286** (1987) 683; G. Martinelli and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Lett. **B217**, (1989) 319
- [4] V. L. Chernyak and I. R. Zhitnitsky, Nucl.Phys. **B246** (1984) 52
- [5] M. Gari and N. G. Stefanis, Phys. Lett. **B175** (1986) 462; Phys. Rev. **D35** (1987) 1074
- [6] I. D. King and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl.Phys. **B279** (1987) 785
- [7] V. L. Chernyak, A. A. Ogloblin, and I. R. Zhitnitsky, Z. Phys. **C42** (1989) 569
- [8] C.-R. Ji, A. F. Sill, and R. M. Lombard-Nelsen, Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 165
- [9] C. E. Carlson and J. L. Poor, Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 2070
- [10] N. G. Stefanis, Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989) 2305; *ibid.* **D44** (1991) 1616 (E)
- [11] V. L. Chernyak, A. A. Ogloblin, and I. R. Zhitnitsky, Z. Phys. **C42** (1989) 583
- [12] C. E. Carlson, Phys. Rev. **D34** (1986) 2704
- [13] G. A. Warren and C. E. Carlson, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 3020
- [14] P. Stoler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1003; Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 73
- [15] C. E. Carlson and J. L. Poor, Phys. Rev. **D38** (1988) 2758
- [16] G. R. Farrar *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B311** (1988/89) 585
- [17] C. E. Carlson, M. Gari, and N. G. Stefanis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 1308
- [18] J. G. Körner and M. Kuroda, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 2165; R. G. Arnold, C. E. Carlson, and F. Gross, Phys. Rev. **C21** (1980) 1426; M. Gari and W. Krümpelmann, Z. Phys. **A322** (1985) 689; Phys. Lett. **B173** (1986) 10

- [19] W. Bartel *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B28** (1968) 148; S. Galster *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D5** (1972) 519; J. C. Alder *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B46** (1972) 573; S. Stein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 1884; R. Siddle *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B35** (1975) 93
- [20] N. G. Stefanis and M. Bergmann, Preprint RUB-TPII-21/92 (1992)
- [21] Particle Data Group, J. J. Hernández *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B239** (1990) 1, and references therein
- [22] M. Bergmann and N. G. Stefanis, in preparation
- [23] M. Anselmino, F. Caruso, and S. Forte, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 1438; M. Anselmino and F. Murgia, Torino preprint DFTT 5/92 (1992)
- [24] M. Peskin, Phys. Lett. **B88** (1979) 128
- [25] M. F. Gari and N. G. Stefanis, Phys. Lett. **B187** (1987) 401
- [26] J. Hansper, R. Eckardt, and M. F. Gari, Z. Phys. **A341** (1992) 339; R. Eckardt, J. Hansper, and M. F. Gari, Z. Phys. **A343** (1992) 443
- [27] J. M. Cornwall, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1453
- [28] R. Barbieri, R. Gatto, and R. Kögerler, Phys. Lett. **B60** (1976) 183; R. Barbieri, R. Gatto, and E. Remiddi, Phys. Lett. **B61** (1976) 465; *ibid.* **B106** (1981) 497
- [29] V. A. Novikov *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **C41** (1978) 1
- [30] S. Y. Hsueh and S. Palestini, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) R2181
- [31] N. Isgur and C. H. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 1080; Nucl. Phys. **B317** (1989) 526
- [32] A. V. Radyushkin, Nucl. Phys. **A527** (1991) 153c; *ibid.* **A532** (1991) 141c; A. P. Bakulev and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 223
- [33] H.-N. Li and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B381** (1992) 129; H.-N. Li, Stony Brook preprint

ITP-SB-92-25 (1992)

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Profile of the heterotic nucleon distribution amplitude.

FIG. 2. Profiles of the model distribution amplitudes for $\Delta^+(1232)$ described in the text.

FIG. 3. Comparison with available data of the transition form factor $\gamma p \Delta^+$ calculated with the heterotic nucleon distribution amplitude and three different model distribution amplitudes for the Δ^+ isobar, as explained in the text. The solid horizontal lines are predictions for the absolute value of G_M^* at $Q^2 = 15 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ of other nucleon distribution amplitudes labeled CZ [4], GS [5], KS [6], and COZ [7]. The data denoted by open circles are from [14].

FIG. 4. Comparison with available data of the transition form factor $\gamma p \Delta^+$ calculated with the heterotic nucleon distribution amplitude and the heterotic distribution amplitude for the Δ^+ isobar. Three different calculations are shown: the one-loop approximation of $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ (solid line), a modified expression for $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ which takes into account a dynamical gluon mass $m_g(Q^2)$ (dashed-dotted line), and the effect of Q^2 -evolution of the coefficients B_n^Δ (dashed line).

TABLES

TABLE I. Expansion coefficients, B_n^Δ , of the model distribution amplitudes for $\Delta^+(1232)$, discussed in the text.

B_n^Δ	CP	FZOZ	Heterotic
B_2^Δ	0.35	-0.175	-0.2499
B_3^Δ	0.4095	1.071	0.3297
B_5^Δ	0.1755	-0.486	-1.6205

TABLE II. Moments $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \leq 3$ of the model distribution amplitudes for $\Delta^+(1232)$ in comparison with the sum-rule constraints. The numbers in parentheses are those given by FZOZ [16].

Moments	Sum rules		Models	
$(n_1 n_2 n_3)$	$T_\Delta(FZOZ)$	CP	FZOZ	Heterotic
(000)	1	1	1	1
(100)	0.31—0.35	0.35	0.325 (0.32)	0.321
(001)	0.35—0.40	0.30	0.350 (0.36)	0.357
(200)	0.14—0.16	0.16	0.150	0.14
(002)	0.15—0.18	0.123	0.160	0.151
(110)	0.07—0.1	0.101	0.080 (0.07)	0.078
(101)	0.09—0.13	0.089	0.095 (0.1)	0.103
(300)	0.06—0.09	0.085	0.083 (0.085)	0.073
(003)	0.06—0.10	0.060	0.085 (0.081)	0.071
(210)	0.025—0.04	0.039	0.030 (0.025)	0.027
(201)	0.04—0.06	0.035	0.037 (0.04)	0.040
(102)	0.035—0.06	0.031	0.037 (0.039)	0.040
	$V_\Delta(CP)$			
(001)	0.33—0.37	0.35	0.325	0.321
(002)	0.14—0.18	0.16	0.15	0.14
(101)	0.072—0.12	0.095	0.088	0.091

TABLE III. Charmonium decays in $\Delta\bar{\Delta}$ for the models discussed in the text.

Amplitudes	CP	FZOZ	Heterotic
M_1^Δ	11418.23	21585.99	11651.26
M_2^Δ	30924.07	48233.23	26277.40
M_0^Δ	1480.67	1882.31	1134.94
Observables			
$BR\left(\frac{{}^3P_1 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta}}{{}^3P_1 \rightarrow all}\right)$	$0.311 \times 10^{-3}\%$	$1.113 \times 10^{-3}\%$	$0.324 \times 10^{-3}\%$
$BR\left(\frac{{}^3P_2 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta}}{{}^3P_2 \rightarrow all}\right)$	$0.100 \times 10^{-3}\%$	$0.106 \times 10^{-3}\%$	$0.072 \times 10^{-3}\%$
$\Gamma({}^3S_1 \rightarrow \Delta\bar{\Delta})$	$0.439 \times 10^{-2} \text{ keV}$	$0.709 \times 10^{-2} \text{ keV}$	$0.258 \times 10^{-2} \text{ keV}$